

REMARKS

Claims 2-20 are now pending in the application. Claim 1 is cancelled by this amendment. Minor non-narrowing amendments have been made to the claims to simply overcome the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments to the claims contained herein are intended to broaden the scope thereof or are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6, 13-17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Minor non-narrowing amendments have been made to Claims 6, 13, 19 and 20 to overcome these rejections. Claims 14-17 now depend from definite Claim 13. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections and allow each of these claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 AND 103

Independent claim 1 has been cancelled. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection thereto and the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 7, 8 and 11, that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 5, is rendered moot. The Examiner has indicated that independent Claim 5 is in condition for allowance, therefore Applicant submits that

each of the claims dependent therefrom, either directly or indirectly, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 has also been amended to depend from amended independent Claim 5 and Applicant submits that therefore it is in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner indicated that Claim 5 is objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 5 has been amended to independent form and includes the limitations of each of the claims from which it depended, therefore Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 5 is in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 2-4 and 6-12 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 5, and the Applicant submits that each of these claims are also in condition for allowance. The Examiner further indicated that Claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant has non-narrowingly amended independent Claim 13 to overcome the rejections cited by the Examiner, and Applicant believes that independent Claim 13 is now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant submits that Claims 14-17, that depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 13, are also in condition for allowance. The Examiner has allowed independent Claim 18, and Applicant has non-narrowingly amended dependent Claims 19 and 20, dependent either directly or indirectly from allowed independent Claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 19-20 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

12/23/83

By: _____

Michael L. Taylor
Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600